+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 2005

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairperson

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairperson

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY

TERESA BROOKS

THOMAS BURRELL, Intern

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES

MARGARET BUTLER

DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Associate Deputy Staff Director

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

STAFF PRESENT (Continued):

RUSSELL CHRISTIAN, Intern

IVY DAVIS, Director ERO/Acting Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit

CARMEN DAUGHERTY, Intern

TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director

BARBARA FONTANA

LATRICE FOSHEE

DORELLE GRAY

GEORGE M. HARBISON, Director, Human Resources Division/Acting Chief, Budget and Finance Division

SETH JAFFE

TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director for Management, Office of Management

EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian

JENNY PARK

EILEEN RUDERT

AONGHAS ST. HILAIRE

VANESSA WILLIAMSON

MICHELLE WOOLLEY, Intern

AUDREY WRIGHT

MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

LISA NEUDER

KIMBERLY SCHULD

AGENDA

APPROVAL OF AGENDA 4
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 13, 2005 MEETING 4
ANNOUNCEMENTS
STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT 8
STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES
PROGRAM PLANNING
FUTURE BRIEFINGS 60
WEBSITE MANAGEMENT 89
FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS 95

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:31 a.m.)
3	Approval of Agenda
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: At this point, we'll
5	get started. Okay. The first item on the agenda is
6	the approval of the agenda. May I have a motion to
7	approve the agenda?
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a second.
-0	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.
.1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor say aye.
L2	(Vote taken.)
.3	Approval of Minutes of May 13, 2005 Meeting
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition.
_5	The motion carries. The second item on the agenda is
-6	the approval of the minutes for the May 13 th meeting.
-7	May I have a motion?
-8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved.
_9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any discussion? Let's
22	vote. All in favor, please say aye.
23	(Vote taken.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition.
25	Okay. The motion carries.

Announcements

Now we're up to the announcements. I'm
saddened to announce the passing of Dr. Murray
Friedman, a former Vice Chairman of this Commission
serving from 1986-1989. Dr. Friedman was appointed
Vice Chairman of the Commission by President Ronald
Regan, after establishing a long and accomplished
career in Civil Rights. Among other accomplishments,
Dr. Friedman was the Director of the Mid-Atlantic
Chapter of the American Jewish Committee from 1959-
2002, as well as being Regional Director of the Anti-
Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in Richmond,
Virginia from 1954 until 1959.

After his time at the Commission, Dr. Friedman went on to create and direct Temple University's Feinstein Center for American Jewish History. Murray Friedman was a Civil Rights Activist, prominent Jewish leader, author, historian. He will be sorely missed.

Also, I am pleased to announce that June $19^{\rm th}$, this Sunday, marks the $140^{\rm th}$ anniversary of "Juneteenth", the oldest nationally celebrated commemoration of the ending of slavery in the United States. On June $19^{\rm th}$, 1865, a Union General, Gordon

Granger, rode into Galveston, Texas to inform its residents of the Civil War's end, which occurred two months earlier. Two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, Granger's General Order Number Three finally freed the last 250,000 slaves.

As we celebrate the end of slavery, we also take this time to recognize the many contributions of African Americans to our culture. African Americans have contributed to the vitality, success, and prosperity of our nation. Today, "Juneteenth" is a day that not only celebrates the end of bondage, but also emphasizes the accomplishments of African Americans made possible by the elimination of the greatest barrier to these achievements, which was slavery.

Okay. This past Monday, on June 13th, the United States Senate passed a resolution expressing its regrets to the relatives, as well as to the nearly 5,000 Americans who were documented as having been lynched by vigilante mobs from 1882 to 1968. Almost 3,500 of the nearly 5,000 people murdered were black Americans. Although the resolution was late, it is a welcome gesture to help heal the wounds caused by such a great injustice.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And at this point I would like to announce some of our -- well, all of our summer interns. Is Russell Christian here? Okay. Well, on June 6th, Russell Christian began an internship in the Office of the Staff Director. Russell is a second-year law student at Ave Maria School of Law in Ann Arbor, Michigan. He graduated from Catholic University in 2002. Russell worked for two years as a freelance journalist, and as a fourth grade Social Studies teacher before entering law school.

Thomas Burrell, time served, welcome. Mr. Burrell started on June 9th. He began his internship in the Office of the Staff Director. Thomas is a third-year law student at American University. Thomas was recently an intern at the Department of Justice in the Environmental Division. Welcome.

Carmen Daugherty, welcome. On May 23rd, Carmen began her internship in the Office of General Counsel. Carmen is a third-year law student at Tulane University. She is a former intern at the United States Department of Education, the Office for Civil Rights in Boston, Massachusetts, so you worked with Tom, one of our strong offices there at the Department of Education. Carmen also has volunteered for two semesters to mentor and tutor at-risk second grade

2.0

	students at an elementary school in New Orleans.
2	And Michelle Woolley, welcome. On May
3	31 st , Michelle began her internship with the Office of
4	General Counsel. Michelle is a second-year student at
5	American University. She is a former Policy Assistant
6	at the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, as well
7	as being a former intern with the American Association
8	of the University of Women. We have a great crop of
9	interns, once again, welcome.
10	Russell, I understand that Russell just
11	walked into the room. Russell, welcome aboard.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Isn't it the guy who
13	comes in late brings the donuts?
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And the coffee.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I don't have
16	any additional announcements. Chairman, do you have
17	any additional announcements that you'd like to make?
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, I'm sorry.
19	I didn't mean to interrupt.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Share the notes with
21	the rest of the class.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, we better rip that
23	one up. At this point, we'll hear from the Staff
24	Director.
25	Staff Director's Report

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Vice Chairman, Commissioners, if it please the Commission, I'd like to extend my written report with some additional remarks regarding GAO implementation and related agency reforms, Human Capital reforms, and Anti-Deficiency issues.

As the Commissioners know, we have been working very diligently to implement GAO and OPM reforms during a nine month period to end approximately the middle of January, 2006. Many of the recommendations have already been implemented, but there is quite a series of challenges coming up.

We issued our 60-day follow-up report to Congress and OMB on June 6th, 2005, providing essentially a blueprint of the way in which we intend to respond to the October, 2004 and April, 2005 report. Our response to the April, 2005 report was as far as we can tell, the first time that we have appropriately and timely responded to a GAO report of this kind.

One of the criticisms that we had received from GAO is that we have not been responding to their reports in the manner required by law, so at a minimum, simply by providing this blueprint, we responded to one of their criticisms, but we have also

set forth a fairly extensive program for reforming management and operations program planning, strategic planning, and related matters.

We now have staff level working groups specifically working on issues such as strategic planning and financial reform in order to develop implementation strategies for the various reforms. Along those lines, with the efforts of the Associate Staff Director, Deputy we have distributed to a chart showing significant Commission management reporting requirements in order to ensure that we are timely providing the reports required to other agencies. As has been noted by GAO and others in the past, the agency failed to provide a large number of reports that are required.

By way of example, earlier this month we submitted the Federal Information Security Management Act Report regarding information technology security, and to the best of our knowledge that had not been provided in the past, but is required by law, and we're making sure that we are providing the reporting that is required.

We have also been working on procurement issues of various sorts to try to implement the agency reforms. The Commission voted a few months ago, for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

instance, to have a full audit of the Commission's finances for fiscal year 2004. If we feasibly could do so in light of our finances, we are putting together a statement of worth for audit for 2004 and 2005.

In addition, our Office of Management has updated and verified object class codes to ensure accuracy of financial reporting. This is a matter that was raised in April, 2005 and October, 2004 reports, and we now believe we have strengthened our ability to ensure that budget matters are accurately inputted.

In addition, the Administrative Services Division has cleared up Federal Procurement Data Center fiscal year 2003 data input backlog, and completed more than 70 percent of the fiscal year 2004 backlog as of the end of May, 2005. This is in response to an additional criticism from the GAO's April, 2005 report. Our ability to continue with this is going to be a little bit more difficult by some of recent attrition. One of the key people the responsible for helping to deal with that particular GAO criticism is no longer on the staff, but we have been making significant progress on that matter in May and early June.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In addition, we are working on Human Capital reform efforts that coincide with criticisms that we received from the OPM report because, after all, implementing the GAO October, 2004 report requires that we also implement the recommendations from OPM that are referenced in the GAO October, 2004 report.

We understand that the Office of Personnel Management is tentatively planning to conduct another Human Capital oversight review of the Commission in September of this year. Fortunately, we have already been working to ensure that we have our Human Capital house in order by that time. As you may recall, we Office have detailee from the of Personnel Management who has been helping us to institute Human Capital reform, which should hopefully get some very key operational reforms in place in advance of the OPM's visit.

This will include, for instance, the development of a comprehensive, strategic Human Capital plan that outlines the Commission's key Human Capital challenges, and provides planned initiatives to address those challenges; for instance, identifying and addressing workplace competency gaps, forecasting retirement and attrition, and developing appropriate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

recruitment and retention strategies, and ensuring that we have the systems in place to create a high performing and accountable workforce.

In addition, we are developing a Human Capital accountability system, as required by law and regulation, which will establish a process for continually improving agency performance by monitoring and evaluating our Human Capital Management programs and activities, and identifying and implementing necessary improvements.

Finally, I would like to follow-up on my recent reports regarding Anti-Deficiency issues. As the Commissioners may recall, I have reported that the Commission had deferred approximately \$75,000 of our fiscal year 2004 rental obligations until FY 05, and paid that rent with funds from the fiscal year 05 appropriations. When we learned of this deferral, we had the legal and financial staff focus on what had to be done to fix those problems.

Internal research revealed that the rent deferral agreement violated two provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act. We have now provided the appropriate notice to the White House, to Congress, and to other agencies of those violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act.

We have also informed GSA and made them aware that we will need to rescind the agreement by which the \$75,000 in rent was repaid. We expect that by the beginning of August they will rescind that agreement, repaying us the \$75,000 taken from our 2005 account, but taking an equal amount of money from our fiscal year 2004 account. When that takes place, we will, on the one hand, have an additional \$75,000 for this year, but we will have a deficiency in our `04 account which is estimated as being approximately \$56,800.

After discussions with OMB and legal research by agency staff, it is our understanding that we have an obligation to mitigate that deficiency by seeking a supplemental appropriation. OMB is working on this matter, and we are working with them, and we expect that they will advise us to seek a supplemental appropriation, which may be in the amount of the \$75,000 rent that had been deferred.

In addition, I have earlier made reference to an administrative award previously paid out of the Department of Treasury's General Judgment Fund, for which our repayment is now required. That was a significant award based on a 2002 matter. We will be required to reimburse the Judgment Fund with 2002

money.

2.0

It appears at this point as if that repayment will cause a deficiency in our 2002 account. It is the advice of our Office of General Counsel that that is not, in and of itself, a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act requiring the same sort of reporting that we did for 2004.

On the other hand, it will be a deficiency requiring similar mitigation. OMB is recommending that we seek supplemental appropriations for the two years together, and they are working with us in terms of providing the appropriate paperwork in order to address the 2002 and 2004 deficiencies.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: How much is the `02 number?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I will be happy to provide that information in confidence to the Commissioners. If the Commission requires it to be provided on the record, I will need advice of counsel.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, no, no. Okay. I understand it was part of a judgment under a settlement agreement.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It is not actually a settlement agreement. It is an award from an administrative agency. However, I am advised that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there are Privacy Act protections that prevent us from going into the details publicly. I can provide in 2 some other forum the information to the Commissioners. 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: All right. Thank you. 4 5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And are these supplementals likely to come through? Do you have --6 7 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We don't have 8 information on that at this point. What we do have 9 information, is that we are required to seek them. Wе 10 are not aware of any adverse ramification to the 11 agency if they are not granted, but we are required to 12 seek them by way of mitigation. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So you're saying that 14 in the event the supp is denied, that we would not 15 have an obligation to remedy the problem. 16 make that attempt and fail, we would not have to 17 repay, or we could not repay the money. 18 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We've been advised 19 by legal counsel that we do have an obligation to 2.0 mitigate, but that that obligation can be satisfied by 21 seeking a supplemental request, which we can do by 22 working with OMB. If the Commissioner is interested 23 in more detail, we could certainly get further from 24 our general counsel.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM:

25

but the

No,

1	question Jerry is posing is if we do not get the
2	supplemental, what are our obligations at that point?
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It is my
4	understanding that we have no further obligation then
5	to seek the supplemental.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I see.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: By seeking a
8	supplemental, we have satisfied our obligation to
9	mitigate.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That means we don't
11	have to go to the blood bank.
12	COMMISSIONER REYNOLDS: At least not for
13	that issue.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Anything else?
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: On the question
16	of the violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act, what is
17	we have reported those violations. What do you
18	expect down the road as a consequence of those
19	violations?
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We have reported
21	the violations and as part of the general reform
22	efforts, we are developing revised policies regarding
23	Anti-Deficiency in order to ensure that it won't recur
24	in the future, so we are taking steps to make sure
25	that it won't happen again. But there are no specific

1 penalties to the agency. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: These steps that 3 you're taking to ensure that we don't have this problem going forward, could you unpack that? 4 5 you describe some of the measures that we'll take to reduce the likelihood that this will happen? 6 7 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would be pleased 8 to do that in a future Commission meeting. What we do 9 have right now is a process in place for developing 10 those procedures, and that is going on through the 11 staff level working groups. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any other 13 questions, comments? Are you done? 14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If there are no 15 further questions, that's my report. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. Ι 17 guess before we get to the -- well, as a prelude to 18 the next issue, the New Hampshire SAC Report. Did 19 everyone receive a copy of that report? And more 20 importantly, has everyone reviewed it? Are we ready 21 to vote on whether we'll accept this or not? 22 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I 23 personally got it too late in order to review it. 24 I am reluctant to vote on reports that I have not had 25 the time to read. Obviously, if I'm alone in not

1	having
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You are not. Yes,
3	Commissioner Braceras.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: My understanding -
5	correct me if I'm wrong - is, aren't we supposed to
6	accept the report unless there are procedural
7	deficiencies in terms of how it was put together? In
8	other words, we're not voting on the substance of the
9	report, and whether or not we agree with the frame and
10	the format of the report.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I just
12	raised that question with the Chair, and there seems
13	to be some confusion over here.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We have to accept
15	it unless there are procedural irregularities, and
16	maybe I'm wrong.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I'm going to
18	have to defer to Ken. I don't know how these have been
19	treated in the past.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It's my
21	understanding that procedural irregularities and
22	quality issues have been raised in the past, as
23	opposed to substantive objections to the content of
24	the report.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I don't know

what a quality issue is, as opposed to a substantive issue.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, let's talk to someone from staff. Is there anyone here who could shed some light on this issue? Historically, what have we done? Yes. And for the record, please state your name.

and MS. DAVIS: Ivy Davis, I'm the Director of the Eastern Region. And that, by the way, is Aonghas St. Hilaire, who is the Social Science Analyst who is responsible for having written the The issue of quality really deals with report. questions of the quality of the writing, in terms of whether it's a well-written document, I guess, grammatically for the most part is what we are talking about, so we're not really voting on the substance of the report.

This is the SAC's findings, and their recommendations to you, so the question is whether you're willing to authorize its publication by the And it's published Commission. when the Commission, unlike Commission reports which are published by the GPO, these reports are done Dorothy in our xerox room. They're xeroxed reports, and they're made available to members of Congress from

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	the particular state. If the substance is of a
2	particular issue that might be important to committees
3	dealing with those subjects, made available to them,
4	as well; as well as people in the state.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I just ask the
6	question? Are there particular rules that outline our
7	responsibility with respect to the SAC reports? In
8	other words, is my understanding correct, and is that
9	outlined somewhere?
LO	MS. DAVIS: The Administrative
L1	Instructions AI 5-7 deal with SAC reports and the
L2	process for producing those reports, getting those
L3	reports to you. There is a checklist that is provided
L 4	to the Staff Director as the report goes to the Staff
L5	Director for his review before submitting it to you,
L6	that deals with those questions, as well.
L7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But my assumption
L8	that we accept the report other than in cases of
L9	procedural irregularity or poor quality, that's not
20	just past practice, that is in the AIs.
21	MS. DAVIS: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And so the motion - we
23	would basically vote on whether to publish or not.
24	MS. DAVIS: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Gotcha.

1	MS. DAVIS: Okay.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions
3	for Ms. Davis? Okay. Thank you. Okay, Vice Chair.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: In that case, I
5	remove my statement of erase my statement of
6	reluctance because we're not voting on the substance
7	of this. As I said, I raised that question earlier
8	and there was some confusion here about whether
9	what our obligations were, and I think it is now
10	clarified.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. But there still
12	remains an issue. Are we ready to vote to decide
13	the issue whether we will publish this document.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I move that
15	we do vote to publish this document.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
17	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'll second.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
19	favor.
20	(Vote taken.)
21	State Advisory Committee Issues
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any objections?
23	Okay. The motion carried. Next up, the rechartering
24	process for State Advisory Committees. I'd like to
25	move that the Staff Director develop amendments to the

Commission's regulations and policy that the following occurs. (A) The Commission Staff will recommend for State Advisory Committee membership persons that represent a diversity of skills and experiences, including but not limited to Social Science methodology, legal research and analysis, statistical methods and technical writing and editing; (B) Commission Staff will recommend for State Advisory Committee membership persons who have demonstrated an interest in Civil Rights issues that relate to race, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origins in addition to voting rights, this motion will more closely align the State Advisory Committee members of interest with the agency's jurisdictions and will supersede the prior policy pursuant to which State Advisory Committees were required to recommend men or women interested in women's rights and disability rights, racial minority members, subject matter experts, but which does not expressly track agency's statutory mandate.

This motion does not alter Commission policy with respect to drawing State Advisory Committee members from people knowledgeable of the State's governmental machinery and public service sector, and people involved in and drawn from such

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

influential sectors as business and financial communities, organized labor and the news media, and finally religious groups. (C) Commission Staff will policy non-discrimination follow the of recommending individuals for State Advisory Committee membership.

The Staff Director will propose regulatory language to amend 45 CFR, Section 703.5(b) to replace the requirement that the State Advisory Committees be reflective of the different ethnic, racial, religious communities within each state, and representative -- with respect to the sexes, political affiliation, age, handicap status. This function will also supersede prior policies pursuant to which all minority group members on a State Advisory Committee are to be no less than 40 or more than 55 percent of the committee, and pursuant to which minority membership on the committee would roughly reflect the ratios in which minority members are found in the state's population. This motion is not intended to agency guidance providing that alter current political party be more than 50 percent of a State Advisory Committee's membership.

That was a lot to digest. May I have a second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? Yes. 2 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: She's more senior. Commissioner Braceras. 4 5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: support I this motion, but I have a couple of questions, and the 6 7 first is whether we might want to add a provision that 8 would term limit members of the SACs. I don't know if 9 that's been discussed at all. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, at least not to my 10 11 knowledge that particular issue hasn't been discussed, 12 but this is good opportunity have that to 13 conversation. 14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So that's 15 one issue I just wanted to put on the table and open 16 up for discussion. And secondly, and this goes back to the discussion we just had with Ms. Davis about the 17 18 and substance of the reports from the SACs 19 regional offices, and what our responsibility is in 2.0 terms of approving reports that don't come directly 21 out of the Commission. And my question is, are we 22 looking at larger issues of reform in terms of the 23 Commission and Commissioners' role in approving the 24 content of reports that we don't produce?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, as written, this

1 motion does not deal with that issue. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I know that it 2 3 doesn't deal with it. My question is, are 4 beginning the process of looking at that issue? 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I guess the way I would interpret it is, should we? And let's talk 6 Do you have anything in mind in terms of 7 reform measures? 8 9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, yes, but I'm 10 not sure this is the appropriate forum right now for 11 discussing the nitty-gritty of that. I'm just 12 wondering whether we are looking beyond the 13 chartering process to the Commission's 14 publishing reports that we don't directly have a hand 15 in, and whether that process needs to be reformed. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It sounds like we need to have some additional conversations on that issue, 17 18 and I think we should all just give this some thought, 19 and try to frame out the issues for a subsequent 20 I don't think that we have enough time to meeting. 21 flesh this issue out right now. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, of course not. 22 23

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, of course not.

I just think as we begin the process of reforming the

Commission, in addition to the reforms we passed last

time, which were internal reforms to the Commission

24

1 itself, and the reforms we're looking at in terms of the budget, a third area we need to begin to look at 2 3 is how we deal with the substance coming out of the 4 regions and the SACs. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Not just the 7 reports, but the projects that they propose, and the 8 briefings they may put on, and all of their work. 9 think we need to begin to look at what is our 10 relationship with the SACs in terms of shaping their 11 agenda, or endorsing their agenda. 12 COMMISSIONER REYNOLDS: Would it be 13 helpful if we have the Staff Director prepare a 14 document that discusses in detail the current 15 relationship between headquarters and the SACs? 16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I suppose. Ι 17 don't want to create more work. Maybe it's something 18 that we want to establish, yet another working group 19 something that can just have informal on or we 20 conversations about. I just raise it for the 21 peripheral vision of the other commissioners. Commissioner 22 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 23 Yaki goes next, actually. You're next. 24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, okay. I have

several questions on the motion. The first one as a

1	preliminary issue is, what is the status of do we
2	actually have proposals for rechartering pending?
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And how many of them
5	are there?
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, I can't give you
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I know we got that
8	letter from the New Jersey
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There are quite a few.
LO	Ken, do you have a better form of numbers?
L1	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: There are roughly
L2	two-thirds or more of the State Advisory Committees
L3	for which the charters are either due or overdue for
L4	rechartering, and they are in various stages in the
L5	pipeline. Some of them are still being looked at by
L6	Regional Directors, some of them have gotten to
L7	Washington, some of them are in different levels of
L8	review, so they're all along the pipeline.
L9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Does the process of
20	ratifying a charter include ratifying the membership,
21	so the membership is proposed at the time of the
22	rechartering, or not?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It's my
24	understanding that those happen simultaneously.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. That was my

concern, because the first question I have is, in adopting these reforms, what impact would that have on those charters that are either at headquarters or already pretty much developed in the pipeline with the RDs. Would this basically throw them all back in the pond to start over again, because obviously, they were developed under criteria that was anti to whatever would be enacted today.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that that's a choice for the Commissioners, and there have been -some SAC members have written and requested that we approve the rechartering under the current criteria.

I have concerns with that primarily because of these ratios that are included in the document. I don't think that Congress could pass a statute with these hard numbers, so my concern is one of legality, but I open up the floor for other comments.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I guess my question would be have we had OGC look at that in terms of the Chairman's concerns? These regulations have been in effect for quite some time, and has OGC opined whether or not these regulations run afoul of any existing law or constitutional provision? I would want that before myself, I would feel comfortable about doing that because I actually have serious reservations about

2.0

changing parts of these guidelines that deal with the desire.

And maybe this is all in the wordsmithing, but I would be amenable to language that would eliminate a strict or even range of percentages, but I do believe that it's important for the SACs to (one) be at least generally reflective of the population of the state that they represent, number one. And number two, in that in some way we encourage and make extra efforts to ensure that those groups who we ostensibly are the watchdogs for are also members of the SACs, as well. And I think that diversity is a very important goal, and I think that the composition of the SACs to reflect that diversity should be a very important goal.

Do I think, necessarily, that it has to be at 40, or 50, or 60 percent? Not necessarily, but I think that to completely eliminate any reflection requirement or goal is -- I think would stray from what it is we were created to do, and who we're supposed to represent.

And finally, just as a comment on Commissioner Braceras' question about term limits, I hate term limits, and I think that as a personal issue, but as a policy issue, I think that if we were

to do one, it would have to be extremely liberal, because sometimes membership is hard to find. We're asking people to volunteer and give of their time. Institutional memory is an important component in what it is that we do, and given the short time frames in which these SACs exist in terms of their terms of life, I think that we should be very careful about enacting term limits on membership in these committees. So those are my concerns right now.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll try to respond to some of them. I do believe that having OGC take a look at this - that would be a good idea, although I'm fairly confident that at least with respect to the numbers, a quota is hard to defend. And the probability that that would pass legal muster, I believe, is quite low.

With respect to diversity, there are ways to achieve diversity - there are good ways and there are bad ways. And I think that we need to have some further discussions about how we can ensure that we have a policy where people are free to join the process. And it's interesting because this is, I guess, our first conversation where we'll have a debate over first principles. My preference is a non-discrimination policy, as opposed to achieving a goal,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	32
1	which in my view often evolves into numbers. And
2	finally, with respect to term limits, I think that
3	there are arguments on both sides, and many of the
4	things that Commissioner Yaki said with respect to
5	this issue, I agree with.
6	But I guess another concern that I have to
7	that is a counterbalance is the fact that I think
8	it's healthy that we, from time to time, get new blood
9	on the SACs, and for the Commission. I don't think
10	it's a good idea to have someone occupy a seat for
11	ten or
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Almost 30 years,
13	for example.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Be nice. In any event,
15	those are my comments. Commissioner Braceras.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Putting the term

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Putting the term limits issue aside for just a minute, because I didn't mean to throw a monkeywrench into this, and maybe that's something that we can take up separately; but just addressing Commissioner Yaki's concern. I think maybe we can just tinker with the language of this particular motion so that Commissioner Yaki will feel more comfortable with it, and we can still achieve the goal we're trying to achieve here.

I hesitate to ask OGC to take a look at

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it, because we are so under-staffed, and that seems to
me to be a bit of a waste of time, because regardless
of whether or not well, I think it's pretty clear
that the numerical goal here is a quota that has some
legal problems. But even if you disagree with my
conclusion, as a matter of policy, I think it's
probably not wise to have it. And I suspect that a
majority of the Commissioners agree with that, so I
don't think we need a legal determination that the
particular provision doesn't comply with the law in
order to change the provision. So I'd rather not
waste OGC's time with that, and I'd rather just try to
address Commissioner Yaki's concerns by tinkering with
the language as written, and maybe we just need to say
that we will consider all forms of diversity in making
these appointments. And I don't know if a sentence
like that would help. But certainly, I think given
the mission of this Commission, we're all committed to
having the people for whom we're a watchdog be
involved in the process, and to have stakeholders be
involved in the process, and I don't think anything in
this as written precludes that. It seems that
Commissioner Yaki just wants to make sure that we
continue to consider that, but as I read what the
intention of this particular motion, is to eliminate a

1 hard and fast quota, so maybe we just want to amend 2 it. Well, 3 REYNOLDS: Commissioner CHAIRMAN 4 Yaki, would you feel comfortable with including some 5 geographical diversity? Would that allay some of your concerns? 6 7 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Or just some 8 more general language that gets at your concerns, but 9 is not quite -- doesn't flirt with quotas. 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And also, I would 11 note here that it says, "The Staff Director will 12 propose regulatory language to amend", so in other 13 words, we don't have the actual language yet. motion is authorizing the Staff Director to propose 14 15 language, which we don't yet have in front of us. 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, Mr. Chair, if I 17 may speak. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I continue to have two 20 concerns about this. One is a concern raised in 21 response to my question about the impact on re-22 chartering, and this will undoubtedly have an impact 23 on the re-chartering done by the RD's. I mean, 24 obviously, part of my questioning has to

whether or not this was developed

25

all

in

at

consultation, or even with notice to the RD's, or to the SAC chairs, number one. And number two, is that I know full well the wording of pretty much all the Supreme Court cases that deal with the word "quota". I am not saying that we need to do anything like that, or even as the Vice Chair says, to flirt with it, but I do think that when I talk about diversity, and when I talk about the efforts that need to be made, that I think that there should be a goal spelled out about attempting to be reflective of the diversity of the state population that the SAC is supposed to represent. I think it's an important principle that as the Commission, we shouldn't stray from. is a way to write some language that would be amenable to the majority of the Commission on this one, I would be glad to attempt to do it. I don't know if right now is the time, or if this is something that should be done when the Staff Director promulgates the rules and regulations that we're simply authorizing him to do, so I leave that there.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. A quick response. Your question about whether the SACs were involved, the answer is no. My view is that right now we need to try to agree to a concept amongst ourselves, and later on in the process SACs would be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

pulled into the process. And, in fact, I believe that any way would have to be published in the *Federal Register*. There would be notice and comment, so there would be ample opportunities in the future for all the stakeholders to weigh-in on the issue. Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I want to speak in favor of the motion for this reason, the first reason - several reasons, the first being the one you just articulated; that is, I view this as the beginning of the process, not the end of the process. We haven't really even started the discussion, the issue on the question of diversity, and where we are. That issue hasn't been joined yet. What this does, though, is it allows us, I think, to begin the process of having that discussion. I think we need to start that immediately, and so I would favor the motion. favor passing this motion. If we want to add language such that the SAC Directors and the folks in the included in region this process, are opportunity for input prior to us receiving recommendations of the Staff Director. I'm in favor of that, but I don't think that's reason to put this off.

I am concerned in the re-chartering

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	process if we are going to do nothing more than rubber
2	stamp the folks that are currently on those SACs. And
3	if we do that in this context, I think we should make
4	a policy decision as a body relative to the process
5	that they should use to determine both positions and
6	the process they use to develop projects. Now is the
7	time to do that, and this motion would allow us to do
8	that. So I would favor starting the process, starting
9	it now and addressing all of these issues in that
10	process, but it's not a reason, in my view, to put it
11	off.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
13	Kirsanow.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I concur with
15	Commissioner Taylor. Let's move on.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right.
17	Commissioner Braceras.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just one quick
19	comment, and a question. The comment is, I just
20	noticed in the briefing materials we received that it
21	does look as if federal law requires us to consider "a
22	cross-section of those directly affected, interested,
23	and qualified as appropriate to the nature and
24	functions of the committee."

In other words, it seems that federal law

1	and regulations already require us to consider the
2	people affected, and by nature of the work we do, the
3	people affected are minorities and people of color,
4	and people from diverse backgrounds, so that is sort
5	of built into the process already.
6	My question would just be to ask the Staff
7	Director to comment on this from his perspective, and
8	address some of the concerns that have been raised.
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I'd be happy to,
10	Commissioner. There have been so many concerns that
11	have been raised that I'm not sure
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, in
13	particular, are we correct that what this motion does
14	is authorize you to come back to us with specific
15	language?
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes, that's right.
17	Now I believe that to effectuate the change embodied
18	in this motion, we would need to change various
19	documents. One would be the regulation. Of course,
20	we'd have to come to you with a regulation, and a
21	proposed regulation. There are other possible changes
22	to a regulation that we might make at that time based
23	on prior discussions within the Commission.
24	A second set of changes would involve
25	changes to the memorandum of my predecessor, Wilfredo

Gonzalez, of December 17, 1991, which is extensively quoted in the memorandum from which you're reading right now, and which was just distributed earlier this morning. The proposed language changes to the Gonzalez memo have already been suggested here. It's changes to the regulation that would have to be proposed.

Now you might see from the Chairman's memorandum that the regulatory language itself is fairly slight. The regulation, for instance, does not specify either the 40 percent quota, if it's a quota, or the 65 percent cap, but rather provides only for the requirement that the membership be reflective in various ways.

There are various options that the Commission has. One would be to retain the regulatory language, but to change the language from the Gonzalez That could be done fairly easily and fairly memo. quickly, and we have potential language here. change that the Commission wants is to change the regulatory language as provided for in the Chairman's motion, then we can provide additional language for you, and it would not be terribly difficult because the regulatory language is fairly short.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: In developing amendments to the Commission's regulation and policy, I would like those amendments to reflect a partisan diversity of this Commission, and alas, we are down to only one democrat. And I wonder if we could alter I think Commissioner Yaki has raised this motion. some legitimate questions here. I wonder if we could alter this motion such that the Staff Director develop amendments working in consultation with both the Chair and Commissioner Yaki, so that perhaps we could come to some kind of bipartisan agreement here on substance of the proposed policy. I don't want to run roughshod over the questions that Commissioner Yaki has raised.

I also think that when you come back to us, that the question that Commissioner Braceras of exactly what our relationship is to the SACs and our role or non-role in reviewing the substance of reports and so forth. Those are extremely important questions. I mean, this is one agency, and the SACs are part of it. And so that that needs to be part of the package.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, for me, at least conceptually, I view these as two related issues; one is establishing the criteria for re-chartering, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	the other one is more substantive. And if we combine
2	the two, if we deal with both issues, I just want
3	the backlog that continues to build, we won't remedy
4	that problem for a while, because I think that it will
5	take a meeting or two to get our arms around
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think we should
7	deal with this first and separately. But I think what
8	Commissioner Thernstrom and I were suggesting is just
9	that down the road if the process has not already been
10	started, that we consider the broader relationship,
11	and that Commissioners be involved in that discussion
12	through some sort of working group or what have you,
13	down the road.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, that's
15	fine. And let's go back to my first suggested
16	amendment, which is that the number one, which would
17	be I move that the Staff Director develop amendments
18	to the Commission's regulation and policy. I would
19	like to add in consultation with both the Chair and
20	Commissioner Yaki, reflecting the bipartisan nature of
21	this Commission.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Did you smile,
25	Commissioner Yaki, at that comment?

1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just to accept it as a friendly amendment. 2 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was thinking as a self-interested party, I couldn't second it. 4 5 want to -- this is just the last comment I'm going to make on this, and then let's move and vote on this. 6 7 My concern about the process involving the SACs and 8 the re-chartering in the regions is that we're at a 9 time where we're looking to try to make some moves 10 with regard to Capitol Hill, and I just want to make 11 sure we have as many friends as possible during that 12 time period than not. And my only concern was that 13 doing this without warning or notice to them might 14 lose us some of those. That's my concern. I think 15 that in the spirit of the Vice Chair's amendments, 16 that will help make things calm down a little bit, and 17 thank you very much. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Do we have a 19 second? 20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. All in favor. 22 23 (Vote taken.) CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Okay. 24 25 The motion as amended carries. Okay. Well, this

motion to the re-charter packages, I think that that
has to be put off in light of the discussion that's
taken place.
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.
Definitely.
Program Planning
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. In light of
that, we're up to program planning. I move to discuss
the substance of the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation
Report entitled "Federal Funding of Civil Rights", and
to provide the Staff Director with guidance as to the
content of the same. Commissioner Braceras.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. So
just to be clear, we passed the first motion, and
we're deferring number two?
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. The first motion
as amended
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: As amended, right.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And deferring
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Deferring number
two.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. With respect to

1	the funding report, may I have a motion?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: What are we moving
3	to do?
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. I don't
5	need a motion to discuss it. Anyway, the funding
6	report was circulated. Any thoughts? And also, I
7	just want to make clear that the and Commissioner
8	Yaki raised this in an email, I believe, last week,
9	that we're going to try to, to the extent that we can,
10	apply the changes in procedure with respect to
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The Braceras rules.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The Braceras rules
14	let's call it.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Yes. To the
16	extent possible, we will try to apply the Braceras
17	rules. The report was distributed. Any comments?
18	Commissioner Braceras.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think most of
20	the people here know that since the beginning of my
21	tenure on the Commission, I've had some doubt about
22	the usefulness of this type of report, because I
23	simply don't believe that dollars always translate
24	into results. But in any event, I think since a large
25	part of the work has been done. I have no objection to

publishing the raw data, and the charts and the tables are very useful, actually, but I prefer to let the public draw their own conclusions from that set of data, and not to opine on what the numbers mean.

I do appreciate the consideration into some of the variables that Commissioner Redenbaugh had earlier suggested, including inputs and outputs, but I do think that this is the type of document that's best when we let the numbers speak for themselves, and do very little editorializing.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. It appears to me this document is a little bit different than the I've seen in the past while serving on Commission, in so far as Commissioner Braceras indicated this much more attention the pays Redenbaugh concerns related to inputs. And I saw a There are a lot of references lot more inputs here. to the various standards set by various agencies related to how they monitor their own effectiveness. And there's kind of a generalized assessment of their effectiveness based on both inputs and outputs. from my standpoint, I think that this is a qualitative - I'm not sure I want to say improvement - but a qualitative difference from where we were before, that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comports more readily with some of the concerns other Commissioners have addressed to this particular report in the past, so I'd like to commend Staff in that regard.

And I had one question with respect to the conclusion, because it's quite interesting. It seems to me that Staff is being asked to do things that are extremely difficult to do in terms of assessing this particular issue; and that is, I note that on the one, two, three, four, fifth paragraph of the conclusion, it notes that there's a great variation in how these various agencies apply GPRA. For example, GPRA goals relate to Civil Rights, EEOC's uses 24 separate goals to measure success, while OFCCP uses 6 goals. And it's very difficult, it seems to me, to try to come to a uniform conclusion related to the success of various in accomplishing their objectives when agencies they're measuring their own objectives differently. And I just had a question for, I quess it would be Terri, or I'm not sure who would be the appropriate person, but is there any way of coming up with more normative or maybe a common denominator that all agencies use in trying to assess their goals, whether or not they're succeeding? And I know that's difficult to do. You've got 24 here and 6, but are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

there any kind of baseline indices that you could look to to try to measure their effectiveness?

I guess the answer to that MS. DICKERSON: is that we don't know the answer to that, unless we were to actually spend a bit more time on this and analysis, one particular agency, also or on understanding how the process that they go about to determine their evaluation factors, and looking at what into that process, and making goes some comparison among agencies, which we weren't able to do with this level report.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If I may add to that, we've had considerable discussion of just that question. I mean, implicit in this comment about the limited nature of the GPRA goal used by agencies is the question: well, what goals would make more sense? Would it make more sense for them to use the same goals? Would it make more sense for agencies to reconsider the goals they're using?

Now given that this is not one of the socalled major projects of the agency, the resources have not been there. It could be done, certainly. One could imagine a report not just on funding of agencies, but also on results, which looks not just at the ability of agencies to meet the GPRA goals that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

they set for themselves, but also that asks questions like what sorts of results make sense? How should success be measured? And according to more sensible measures of success, how are agencies doing?

That sort of report is feasible, and could be very valuable. It would be a major report requiring not just one staff member, but several staff members, and it might be that one could only do it for perhaps one or a few agencies at a time, as opposed for all of them.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It seems to me that when you've got this type of disparity with respect to how various agencies measure their own outputs, that a lot of game playing can be done, and we can never really assess -- strike that. We have a more difficult job of assessing what's actually occurring at the agency level.

look at the various inputs in evaluation of certain outputs, the report, an different conclusion of certain agency investigations; for example, EEOC - whether or not they're undertaking investigations, or they're closing out reports, or merit closure, so on and so forth. If various agencies have different standards, we don't have any uniform standard by which to measure agencies against

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

one another.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And just as a thought for the future, because I am interested in this kind of report - I It's obviously part of is useful. function to do something like this, but an observation, it may be that in the future if we another report like this for next year, that we try to assess precisely what you have been talking about, Mr. Staff Director, that we take a closer look at some of these issues we can gauge. Maybe we can provide some guidance as to what type of standards need to be met.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We have actually discussed issues of that sort, Commissioner Kirsanow, and it does seem that a report of that sort would be feasible, and potentially very valuable, but it would probably require the resources of a major report. This is not one of the reports that was previously adopted by the Commission for 2006, at this point.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. I just want to commend the Staff for this report. And I think that, as Commissioner Kirsanow just said, this is an extremely valuable report that we have put out for quite some time, and I know that when this report was published in the late 90s, it certainly skewered that

administration, not only skewered but just pointed out a snapshot of what was going on during that time frame. And perhaps they weren't happy about it, maybe other administrations aren't happy with it when we put this out, but the fact is, is that as an independent agency, I think part of our job is to provide the little nudge, provide the little poke, if there is one, if those conclusions are to be drawn from the data that is compiled through these reports.

actually found that it was consistently neutral in its tone, and even the conclusions I thought were more restatements of the narrative that is important to help make sense of some of the text when you put it in its right context. think that this is the kind of report that should be something that we do each year. I know that in our last meeting, I was the only one who voted for the FY 07 version of this, but I would hope that we would keep that under consideration, because as an agency, and because we have the investigatory powers given to us by Congress, we have the ability to get data that the public cannot get. And we have the ability to pool together data from all the different agencies that deal with Civil Rights in the federal government that other people cannot do, except on a piecemeal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

basis, or through FOIA, or through wading through charts and tables that may not be all that recognizable. We have, obviously, the skill-set to do it. We've been doing this for quite some time. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And we know what to ask, we can send this out routinely. This does not seem like it takes a vast amount of time to do, and I think it's extremely useful to our constituencies, to policymakers, and to the general public to see what the federal government is up to. And I think that the inclusion of the strategic outputs and performance is a good and appropriate step which wasn't there before. I think that the addition of it makes it better, and I think that the questions that Commissioner Kirsanow raised in terms of now we know what the outputs are. Now we really need to know what the inputs were to understand the outputs, and whether or not there's commonality, could be a very good major report and very useful to Congress and to the Executive Branch. But I just want to commend the Staff for doing this, and I would hope that the Commission would reconsider doing it in the future.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. After
reviewing this report, I'm persuaded that I may have
been mistaken in voting against doing this type of
report for next year. I took a good hard look at the
report. I concur with Commissioner Yaki, that I
thought that it was neutral in its assessment. I think
you have to come up with some conclusions based on the
data that you do have, and I think those conclusions
based on what I read in terms of the data, made
perfect sense. And I'm not sure if it's consistent
with Roberts Rules of Order since we have already
voted on this, but I'm going to give some more thought
to whether or not we should put forth another motion
sometime in the future to revisit this, incorporating
some of the concerns that I raised previously and the
Staff addressed with respect to making this maybe a
more full-blown report, consistent with our
limitations in terms of resources. I think this is,
frankly, quite valuable. And I am a skeptic when it
comes to money, but this is not what this report
reflects.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Since Staff have been commended, on behalf of the Staff, I'd like to thank the Commissioners for their kind remarks, and to point out that under the direction of Terri Dickerson,

the principal staff member responsible for the good work that you recognize is Margaret Butler, who is with us today.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Good job. Well, my comments. I read the document and there's just a wealth of good data in here, but the data raises questions. In some years, the appropriations will remain flat, but the number of cases resolved at a particular agency will, in some cases, go up, go down, remain the same, so I'd like to see some analysis in terms of correlations.

Also, I served at the Department of Education and the Department of Justice, and I familiar with some of the games that those particular agencies play in terms of the numbers. For example, at the Department of Education, at the Office for Civil Rights, the GPRA standard, at least one of them, is resolving 80 percent of the cases that come through the door within 180 days. One question that I would like us to ask is whether that is a meaningful metric? Have they come close to ever missing that? Are agencies picking GPRA standards that they know that they can easily meet? We are the watchdogs, and our job entails holding people's feet to the fire. And if they're coasting, we should point that out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Also, not picking on the Office for Civil
Rights, but there is a change during the 90s where the
agency went from having full investigations with
respect to complaints to a resolution model where
there was a solution, a canned resolution agreement,
but a very truncated investigation. When I was there,
I said no, in order to ensure that we have captured
the entire scope of the problem, we need to gather
sufficient evidence through an investigation, because
I didn't want to be in a position of imposing
requirements on schools that had not sinned, or
letting schools get away with discriminatory conduct
because my canned resolution agreement did not cover
the full scope of the problem, so I think that we need
to take a hard skeptical look at the data that we
receive from federal civil rights agencies.
COMMITTEE TO THE TOTAL THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL THE TOTAL TO T

that's COMMISSIONER YAKI: think Commissioner Kirsanow's point, and the Staff Director's point about it. And if I just may say, when we were all kind of a little punchy at the last meeting, at the very last meeting, after you left, it just went to heck. The Vice Chair just lost all control. There was a flask, I saw, you know --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm just kidding. But

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	what was interesting is that I remember that we were
2	seriously discussing the fact that for `07, none of us
3	were extremely happy with the choices that had been
4	presented to us for the major reports for `07. And it
5	sounds to me like we're approaching consensus from you
6	with the Commissioner and myself about what the major
7	report for `07 should be.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think that
9	there are a number of people around the table who
10	would like to see some additional work, and the
11	continuation of this report after having an
12	opportunity to go through it, but one question that
13	Commissioner Kirsanow raised is our ability to reshape
14	this document. Well, I guess we'll have to make some
15	choices. I mean, we could revisit the decisions that
16	we made with respect to `07, and it sounds like that
17	we'll probably go down that road at a future meeting.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: We do not need
19	to do it today.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
21	Braceras.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just where do we
23	go from here on this particular report?
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, these hard
25	questions. It seems to me that there is a consensus

that -- at least a preference for a document that is neutral. I would suggest that we scrub this document. I did see some -- there are certain assumptions in this document that jump at me. For example, if the President recommends -- if the President's budget contains X amount, and Congress approves a lesser amount, there is some language suggesting that that was a bad thing. I think that we need to establish benchmarks, or at least discuss why we believe that Congress was right, the President wrong, or the President right and Congress wrong.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse Ι me. mean, I disagree. I don't think we should be saying who's right or who's wrong at all. I think we should simply be stating it, and this comes close. I mean, I have to say this is the most neutral one of these And I reports that I've seen since I've gotten here. appreciate that, and commend the Staff for that, but I don't think with respect to this issue of funding, we should be in the business of saying who's right and who's wrong, just simply what was requested and what was given, period - without any value judgment on that.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree with your assessment, but the document as written, there are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

some areas where a value judgment has been made, at least in my view. I get a sense that this document is much better than what's been produced in the past, but there are still judgments being made as to the appropriateness of the funding levels. Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would move that we would move forward to, I guess, a draft final report incorporating your concerns. I'd like to see, though, if we could in the draft final, the changes that were made so that we could just see what was -- a red line draft. You can tell how much proofreading I do in my job. But what's it called again, between this draft and the draft final, but I think that it is pretty content neutral. And to the extent that there is any editorial judgment, I think it should be confined - not confined, but if there should be a lot of editorial judgment, it should especially be in the section on our funding.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So we will make an exception.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I agree.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Chair, I have a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	question. What is the process for a Commissioner to
2	provide input on this? Should we submit our own black
3	line version, if we have some thoughts? How do we
4	provide input? What level of input is appropriate,
5	that's my other question.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: My suggestion is that
7	we all just take pen to paper and make our edits on a
8	paper, and send it to the Staff Director, as opposed
9	to doing a red line version and having various red
10	line versions.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And then having the
12	computer crash.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So mark up the
16	document, send it to the Staff Director, and the Staff
17	Director will provide a red line version of this
18	document.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think the
20	Staff Director has to include everybody's comments. I
21	think the Staff Director should, in his discretion,
22	adopt those that he thinks are reasonable, and then
23	provide the red lined copy to the group for a vote at
24	the next meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I agree.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree.

wanted to raise, to the extent I thought a movement in terms of a consensus. I wanted to say that I have a predisposition against expanding this document. I think this is very close to the type of work we should do every year, the document we have before us. The raw data I liked a lot, and in terms of our discussion at our last meeting relative to larger and major projects, I would have a preference probably against expanding this. I think this is some good work we do, and I think this is the type of work we should continue to do. So I just wanted to put that on the table, since I thought a consensus forming.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. So the Staff Director's office has its marching orders on this issue.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Since there was a consensus to revisit this document during the July meeting, I suppose there should be thought to at what date the Commissioners would be providing comments to us in order that we can turn it around and have it available in a draft final.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What date do you need comments by?

2.0

ĺ	60
1	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Would the
2	Commissioners be able to provide comments within a
3	two-week period?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think that July 1st
5	would probably be the best.
6	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: July 1st should be
7	
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Then there's the
9	holiday in-between, and they need to prepare the
10	agenda.
11	Future Briefings
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So we have our
13	deadline. All right. Next up, it's a motion
14	regarding the Sander Article. There's a motion to
15	have Staff arrange a briefing before the Commission
16	concerning the findings of UCLA Professor Richard
17	Sander in his article entitled, "A Systematic Analysis
18	of Affirmative Action in American Law Schools". The
19	briefing would feature Professor Sander, and at least
20	one other academic expert on the subject matter of
21	Professor Sander's article, who can provide a contrary
22	Wiewpoint Wige Chair Thernstrom

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Since the original discussion of this, at least one of the Commissioners with whom I spoke stated a preference

23

24

1	for having Sander himself. Could it have been you?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, finish the
3	thought.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sander himself
5	at a briefing, and then subsequently allowing
6	Sander to have the floor.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, that came from
8	me.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That came from
10	you.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So why don't
13	you just
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's not a strong
15	preference, at least not at this point. My thought
16	was to have the presenter make his case, and I would
17	prefer to hear someone state their views, and state it
18	in a way that's not anticipating the individuals who
19	will be following him or her. But looking at the
20	schedule that we have, I'm not sure that that's
21	realistic, so I think that let's just forget about my
22	comment, and we would have Sander and a critic at the
23	same briefing.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right.
25	Well, let me say that I have spoken to Sander about
1	

	this briefing. He's very eager to do it, and he's
2	happy to have somebody who provides a contrary
3	viewpoint. In fact, he gave me some possible names.
4	There's been quite a public discussion of this
5	article.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Braceras.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just I guess a
8	point of order. We're discussing the motion on the
9	merits of having the Sander briefing first, and then
10	we will discuss
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The schedule?
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: the calendar
13	for the briefings?
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, let me
16	say something on that. The calendar for the briefing,
17	we cannot decide on a date today without consulting
18	with him.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. All right.
20	So this is
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is he comfortable with
22	the month, with April `06? You're just talking about
23	a date in April of `06, or was it
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I did not
25	mention to him April `06. He's trying to juggle a

1 complicated schedule at this point. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think we're just 2 3 right now addressing whether or not to do it at all. And then the calendar question could be revisited at 4 5 another time. Is that right? VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 6 That's correct. 7 We'll CHAIRMAN **REYNOLDS:** discuss the the briefings after we finish with this 8 order of 9 issue. Commissioner Braceras. 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think this is a 11 great topic. I do think it's important to present an 12 alternate viewpoint. I would be interested in hearing the names of the folks that Professor Sander himself 13 14 has recommended to the Vice Chair, but of the list in the briefing materials here, I very much like the idea 15 having David Wilkins come to debate him. 16 In addition to the fact that he was 17 my Civ. 18 professor at Harvard, I do think that he is well-19 equipped to discuss this issue, as his area of 2.0 expertise is the legal profession. 21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: He was Sander's 22 first recommendation. 23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Great. Great. Ι think that's a fabulous choice, and he is a dynamic 24

speaker, as well. My only other comment would be that

1 with respect to these briefings, I would love to see them done in a way that garners a lot of attention 2 3 from the public and the press, and the community. REYNOLDS: 4 CHAIRMAN So we'll 5 Public Affairs unit loose. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 6 Yes. Our well-7 staffed Public Affairs unit. No, but if there's any 8 way we can have this debate in a setting other than 9 this building, I don't know if that's possible, and 10 make sure that some of the political actors, members 11 of Congress, people from think tanks and all the like 12 are invited and aware of the discussion. I think it 13 could be a very excellent contribution to the debate 14 on this topic. And this is exactly the type of thing 15 I'd like to see where we have an even balanced 16 discussion with different sides represented, I 17 endorse the proposal wholeheartedly. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other comments? 19 Okay. Well, I guess I just want to point out that we 2.0 do not have a motion. 21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I was about to 22 say, I would like to move that the Staff arrange a 23 briefing with Richard Sander. 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second. 25 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And we've already had
2	discussion. All in favor.
3	(Vote taken.)
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Okay.
5	The motion passes.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And let's see if
7	we can try to get David Wilkins.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. And, in
9	fact, whether
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But Ian Ayres was my
11	classmate at Yale, so
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Pardon me?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: One of the names on
14	the list, Ian Ayres, was a classmate of mine at Yale.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I just think David
16	Wilkins is particularly well-suited.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Rick Sander's
18	point to me was that there is I can't remember
19	where it's coming out, but a whole volume of responses
20	to his original analysis, and that David Wilkins was
21	the most thoughtful, and that does not translate into
22	the softest, but really the most thoughtful of all of
23	them.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would be against
25	inviting the last individual, the law student, to

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

debate Professor Sanders.

2.0

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just as a consideration, Lempert was an expert witness for the defendant in the *Grutter* case. Lempert here is one of the individuals named. He was an expert witness in the *Grutter* case, and that might be an interesting perspective.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. We'll work this out, but I think the schedule as we make a date -- well, I think we need to decide who we would like to have with Sander, and then try to juggle as we find out what the schedules for both of them are.

in the proposed schedule that's been referred to, the notion was that a meeting was mentioned as the meeting on the month, which is the first month of each fiscal quarter, which is simply based on the notion that we can do approximately one of these every three months. One thing we might do is perhaps to agree on a schedule with the notion that it be -- that each briefing be held on the fiscal quarter, which is mentioned in the calendar if that can be arranged. And if it can't be arranged, to come back to the Commission. In other words, Staff could go to the speakers, find out whether they're available under

1	either say the April meeting or the May meeting
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So it would just be
3	like "Q" one, "Q" two, "Q" three, and whatever their
4	ability is, and then we start arranging the dates.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's right, but
6	just to make sure that it's not all compressed.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That makes more sense.
8	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: There's just one
9	per quarter.
LO	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Actually, I have
L1	another question - I'm sorry - before we move on. I
L2	meant to ask this before. This is with respect to all
L3	of these proposed briefings. They have a proximate
L4	cost at the bottom, and I'm just not sure how those
L5	numbers were arrived at. They seem a little high to
L6	me if they're just the cost above and beyond staff
L7	time. I don't know if they include an approximation
L8	of staff hours into these projects.
L9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I believe they are
20	a combination of approximate travel cost based on a
21	formula which we could have someone else explain other
22	than myself.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't need the
24	details of the formula.
) 5	CTAFF DIDECTOR MADCHE: Dlug come non-

	craver costs, including court reporters. Perhaps Mr.
2	Byrnes could amplify on the cost.
3	MR. BYRNES: The costs include not only
4	travel costs for both local and out-of-state speakers,
5	but also transcript fees, Lexis Nexus research fees.
6	I believe staff hours is also included within these
7	costs.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We should only invite
9	people who can pay their own way. We're in a budget
10	crisis here.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It doesn't seem
12	that useful to me to have the amount here include
13	staff time, because we're paying the staff whether we
14	do zero briefings or a hundred briefings.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So we might as
17	well get as many briefings out of them as we can, is
18	the way I look at it. So I would just be interested
19	in knowing what is the out-of-pocket cost above and
20	beyond what we already have to pay. In other words,
21	whatever - the Lexis Nexus fees, although I thought
22	that's a flat fee, isn't it, what we pay Lexis Nexus?
23	MR. BYRNES: We'd back that number out
24	also.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So I would

	just the court reporting, the travel, and whatever
2	it costs in terms of xeroxing materials for the press
3	or advertising it in the limited sense.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Court reporting
5	is also we've got a court reporter at every
6	meeting.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We have a flat
8	fee?
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So that's not
10	an additional cost.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. If it's
12	being done at our monthly meeting and we have a court
13	reporter anyway - right - that's not an extra cost.
14	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We would be happy
15	to back-out the fixed costs and provide out-of-
16	pockets. I believe for the court reporter, we base it
17	on the assumption that we would still have a meeting
18	that day, but that to combine
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It takes longer.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's right, the
21	meeting would be longer, so it's a marginal cost of
22	the court reporter.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: But we can
25	certainly provide a separate analysis that just

	provides out-of-pocket.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Yes,
3	because that seems to me the only relevant thing.
4	Okay. Thanks.
5	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Chair, one
6	question.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor.
8	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Historically, have
9	we done these briefings here or have we done them at a
10	separate venue?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Here.
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Here? Well, I would
13	then try to underscore at this point the earlier
14	comment, that in my view, at least, we may be able to
15	generate more publicity if the briefing took place
16	somewhere other than this location. It's an important
17	issue, and
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I don't know if I
19	should be offended or not.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I just want the
21	public to hear this discussion. That's my concern.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. And I'm not
23	proposing incurring any additional costs necessarily,
24	but there may be creative ways we can work with other
25	branches of government or groups to use a room that

1 doesn't cost too much money. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow. 2 3 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This is an had discussed in 4 observation. We the past 5 possibility of using the room up on the Hill. I think that suggestion was received favorably by folks on the 6 7 Hill, and this would also enable folks from Congress 8 to show up if they wish to do so, or at least expedite 9 that process. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I agree. 11 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I just wanted 12 to say something on this. I was also going to remind 13 us of that fact, and it applies, obviously, to more 14 than Sander briefing. We've the got important 15 briefings, a list of potentially important briefings 16 In general, if it's possible, it would be here. 17 better to have them on the Hill. Any disagreement 18 with that? You're looking at me. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, absolutely Ι 20 agree. 21 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would suggest, though, that if the Commissioners do want to have a 22 23 meeting as soon as July, the only location that we

Commissioners wanted a location other than here, it

could probably have it is here.

24

25

And that if the

1 would probably have to be later than July. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Too late to 2 3 move that. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, I certainly 4 can't assure that we would. I mean, it's just one 5 month, so I don't know what --6 7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: It should be the July 8 recess by then. 9 Okay. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Why don't we look into it to see if we can pull it off for the 10 11 first briefing. 12 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean, that is 13 an extremely important briefing. It's shaping up to 14 be a very interesting briefing. It should have --15 there should be wide interest in it. It is a briefing 16 by people across the political spectrum, and I would 17 really like to see it on the Hill. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: On a related note, I 19 think that we should come up with a battle plan in 2.0 terms of public relations. I think that if we're 21 going to conduct these briefings and discuss these 22 important issues, that it's important that we entice 23 the public and the press to attend our meetings, so I understand that we're laboring with -- well, we're 24

short of hands in terms of folks with expertise in

Τ	public relations, but we'll have to call upon Ms.
2	Dickerson and her band of warriors to come up with a
3	plan.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If I could be so
5	bold, I'd like to also volunteer Kim Schuld's services
6	in that regard. I know Kim can be very helpful with
7	media relations, and given the office is short-
8	staffed.
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That would be very
10	helpful.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
12	Yaki, did I see your hand raised?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was just going to
14	say that one of the things to do is if we approve the
15	list, that we can create short synopses of all these
16	and put a little flash or headline on the website to
17	help get that out there, too.
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Is there a
19	consensus that we can put that on the website without
20	any further vote by the Commission?
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any other items
24	to discuss at least with respect to this issue? All
25	right. Next up will be the schedule for the

1	briefings. I don't know if you have the months in
2	front of you, but the first would be a briefing
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Did we do the Besharov
4	motion yet?
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I was under the
6	impression that that was handled after I left at the
7	last meeting, but am I wrong?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's the Vice Chair
9	(Laughter.)
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Was there a vote?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Was there a
12	vote?
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I mean, you're talking
14	as if this is a done deal.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We agreed on it. I
16	just don't remember that we said July, but if that's
17	the case, then
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I think that at
19	some point we did, but I could be mistaken.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, are there any
21	objections to oh, it's in the Minutes?
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's in the
23	Minutes.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is it?
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So it will be July.	
2	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And is it	
3	understood that we are going to try to find, even	
4	though it's on short notice, a location, a better	
5	location for that?	
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.	
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So it's an amended	
8	schedule with the first one being the African American	
9	Stagnation class issue for July. Okay.	
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So that would -	
11	- I'm sorry. Commissioner Braceras.	
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. So	
13	these other briefing topics, do we need to vote to do	
14	them before we vote on the schedule?	
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Didn't we already vote	
16	on these?	
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We voted to do these.	
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: We voted to do	
19	these.	
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's what I	
21	thought. Okay. But we hadn't voted on Sander, we had	
22	only voted on	
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no. Sander just	
24	came up this month.	
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.	

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So right now
2	the only thing we're voting on is the schedule for
3	briefings that have previously been approved.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's right.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And per the Staff
6	Director's recommendation, I would amend the dates to
7	simply say for the Patriot Act, that would be third
8	quarter. Right?
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Fourth quarter.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Third or fourth
11	quarter.
12	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It's the fourth
13	quarter of `05.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: `05, and then for each
15	of the other ones it would be key one - `06; "Q" two -
16	`06; "Q" three - `06; 'Q" four - `06, et cetera.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'm sorry. I
18	didn't follow that. It's which quarter, the Patriot
19	Act?
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The Patriot Act
21	would be fourth quarter `05.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: But at the very
24	end of it, as opposed to the very beginning of it. So
25	we would not have one during the first quarter of `06.

	campus Anci-Semicism would be the first quarter 00,
2	Affirmative Action in Law Schools would be second
3	quarter `06, Voting Rights in the U.S. Territories
4	would be third quarter `06, Voter Fraud and Voter
5	Intimidation would be
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Fourth quarter `06.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We could say
8	fourth quarter `06.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May I ask a
10	question?
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I understand that
13	we voted to do these topics. I guess what I wasn't
14	clear on is whether we voted on the scope of the
15	briefing as represented in these materials.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Where is our
17	institutional memories? Does anyone remember?
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: These materials
19	are new.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The summaries of
22	the topic represent a more abbreviated version of the
23	concept papers that the Commissioners had before them
24	at the time they voted during the last meeting.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Just

because I had some comments on a couple of them in terms of the scope, and I don't know what the appropriate time is to raise those.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's see if we can handle your concerns now.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. The first one is with number one, because it seems to me that Patriot Act is separate, although possibly overlapping with Anti-Arab and Anti-Muslim Intolerance as listed on the schedule here. And so my concern is just that we don't have a topic that's too broad and too unmanageable.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There are two concepts there, and at some points they do relate, possibly, arguably. One, I suppose, would be a critique of the Patriot Act, and the second piece, just getting an update on what's going on in Arab communities.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Personally, I think that's too broad, and my concern is that in the past when we've had these briefings, we've had speakers address so many different angles and so many different aspects of a large topic that the briefing didn't gel in the sense that we had a coherent discussion of a discreet topic between opposing sides, which I think is exactly what we've agreed to do with

the Sander briefing, and why it will be so useful to policymakers. So I would just like to see this narrowed down to the point that we can have a discreet discussion on something, perhaps the provisions that are up of the Patriot Act so that we don't have our speakers going off on tangents. We want this to be as focused and as useful as possible.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. As the person who proposed this, I actually I understand Commissioner Braceras' comments, and actually I was very careful not to go into a complete and total discussion of the Patriot Act as a result. I simply wanted to focus on those provisions dealing with -- that have been cited by, or referenced by either the FBI, or by the Arab and Muslim communities in terms of potential -- well, actions that have resulted in potential Civil Rights issues being brought forward. And the importance of this I think is underscored by the events going on in my home state in Lodi. As you know, they arrested several people, one of whom is alleged to have gone to an Al Qaeda training camp, and certainly I'm not going to pass judgment on the guilt or innocence of anyone there, but certainly we want the U.S. Government to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

find those people who would be terrorists in our
country. But at the same time, there are substantial
questions being raised in the conduct. And subsequent
to those arrests, with the Muslim community in Lodi,
that are clearly where references have been made by
FBI agents, that they are acting pursuant to the
Patriot Act, and where American Muslims feel that they
are being harassed, intimidated, et cetera. So I
understand, Commissioner Braceras, we don't want to
get into this whole thing about the Patriot Act, and
the Warner Act, and all this other kind of stuff. And
I think that I would be amenable to trying to narrow
it down as much as possible, but I do believe that
there are sections and provisions of the Patriot Act
that are being implicated and are being used by law
enforcement right now that to the American Muslim and
the American Arab community are being used in a way
that they believe may infringe upon their Civil Rights
and Civil Liberties.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So, I mean, I think then just to be clear to the Staff, the topic is not really the Patriot Act and Anti-Arab and Muslim Intolerance.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: As it relates to.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: As it relates to.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.			
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I'm not sure,			
3	maybe the Staff can tell us, or you have some ideas,			
4	Commissioner Yaki, of specific speakers we're			
5	considering. But that might help in terms of my			
6	understanding of this topic, because we had some ACLU			
7	folks come in to talk about the Patriot Act,			
8	generally, before.			
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right.			
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I just don't			
11	want to repeat that same discussion.			
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, this would not be			
13	that. This would go to real life experiences and what			
14	people are doing. I'm in contact with the community			
15	in Lodi. I think some of them might be interested in			
16	giving some of the latest experiences of what's been			
17	going on there, and again, I'd be more than willing to			
18	work with the Staff to make sure that this doesn't			
19	become a general indictment of Patriot good/Patriot			
20	bad, that kind of thing.			
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So you don't want an			
22	academic debate over the merits of the Patriot Act.			
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No.			
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.			

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But I also become

concerned when the Commissioners are used as an open forum for people's Gestalt impressions of discrimination, and urban legends, and stories and rumors, and innuendo. And so I'd like to see somebody speak to the very important issues Commissioner Yaki raises, who has data or actual experiences to support those claims, and not just general rumblings in the community.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I understand. Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I wonder if it would be useful, not only with respect to this question; that is, the Patriot Act and Anti-Arab/Anti-Muslim Intolerance, but in general, to pose a concrete question that is attached to each one of them. That is, in the case of the Patriot Act, Commissioner Yaki, you would say what is or what are blah, blah, blah. And that would define the topic in a manageable way. You would be posing the question that would set the limits and I think in general, that would be useful. What is the central question we're getting at?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: What's interesting is that we're basically undergoing the Braceras Rules for this, because we had talked about how we wanted to do exactly this kind of discussion as we got down toward

2.0

the briefing. Now we haven't really quite done it for
the one in July. I don't think we have enough time to
do that, but I'd be more than willing, given that this
is a Q-four thing, to come back in July as a proponent
of this with some specific questions that I can work
out with Staff, that would sort of be the things that
people would come prepared to testify and to talk
about. And so a Department representative who would
be here, whether from DOJ or Homeland Security,
whatever, would be willing to do that. But I think
this is perfectly consistent with the rules that we
talked about, and maybe this is the test case about
how we go about doing it. This discussion is very
helpful, and I would propose that we adopt a schedule,
but I will come back in July with Staff with specifics
about what will be the focus of the questions and the
topics to be asked.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I do think

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I do think that with the Sander briefing, that the nature of the briefing actually poses the question already, because his paper is out there.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And he's going to be presenting and commenting on his own work; and,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

therefore, we know basically what he's going to say, and the person who's invited to critique that has that information, so we're all kind of on the same page of what the question is that the speakers are being asked to address.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That's true, but it is not true --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It is not true of the others.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: -- of any of the remaining ones. And I think with respect to all of them, we need to pose what the central question or questions are, so that we do not have, as Commissioner Braceras has described, these all over the map presentations.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And then I was just going to raise a similar concern about the scope of the Religious Discrimination in the Workplace topic, although I'm just trying to find that page. There it is. This seems to be limited to discussions of religious discrimination towards Muslims, and I'm not sure whether it should be so limited. there have been -- I'm not sure that it shouldn't be expanded include Anti-Catholicism and Anti-Christian bias in the workplace. I don't want to make

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

it too broad, because I don't want to run into the concern of having an all over the place briefing, but I wasn't sure why the scope had been narrowed to the Muslim religion in this particular case.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If I may, the intent wasn't to limit it simply to that issue, but rather to include a discussion of potential increase in discrimination in that area in the context of a broader discussion of religious discrimination in the workplace. That was the intent of the concept paper that's before you. We could certainly delete that portion so that it's simply generally a discussion of the religious discrimination in the workplace issues that are described under scope.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would like to see it more general to include discrimination against Jews and Christians in the workplace, as well. also, there is this whole issue on the flip-side of this debate of what counts as a religion. And, Ken, I think you and I did discuss this at one point, that I think as every employment lawyer knows, there are constantly people inventing new religions get accommodations in the workplace. And the case that always come to my mind is the case, I think from Springfield, Massachusetts, where the employer

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	established a policy against body piercing, and the
2	employee came back and said actually, that was part of
3	her religious beliefs because she was a member of a
4	body piercing cult. And the EEOC, I guess at least in
5	the initial stages, agreed with that employee, so
6	there is the whole issue of what counts as a religion
7	that requires accommodation. And that may be too much
8	to fold into this, but I certainly don't want to see
9	this issue limited to one particular religion. I'd
10	like it to look at discrimination against all faiths
11	in the workplace, and perhaps we want to consider the
12	flip-side of this question, as well.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Unless there are any
14	objections, I think that we should direct the Staff
15	Director to expand the scope in that it will not focus
16	primarily on Muslims.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I don't
18	see why that we can't also have one sentence that
19	defines religion for these purposes.
20	(Simultaneous speech.)
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What I'd like to
22	see is
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's not a
24	legal we're defining for our own purposes.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, I think as

this proposal says in the methodology in terms of the types of speakers that would be invited, what would be interesting to me is to hear from someone, for example, from the EEOC about the numbers and types of complaints that they are receiving, and the types of accommodations that are being provided, or the resistance to providing accommodations that the EEOC might be encountering. That would be something that would be useful and interesting, I think.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.

an accommodation test. I think what some of the -what this seems to indicate is that it's more than
accommodation that's going on. It's harassment and
other types of issues on the basis of faith, or
perceived faith, on the basis of the American Muslim
population. I think that we can make it more generic,
but I don't think we should go into the area of
defining what a religion is.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I withdraw that.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm not sure we should be defining it, but I'd be interested to hear from the EEOC statistics on the types of complaints they're receiving, and how many of them are from

1	traditional major religions, and now many of them are
2	from
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The Church of Satan or
4	something like that.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The Church of
6	Satan - right.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
8	Braceras, do you have any other comments with respect
9	to the remaining briefings?
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, although I
11	assume we're going to be kept informed as these are
12	planned as to speakers, and we'll have opportunities
13	to suggest perhaps speakers, or the precise questions
14	to be addressed to the speakers.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those are in your
16	rules, those are in the Braceras Rules.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. At this point,
19	I believe we need a vote to vote on the actual
20	schedule.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Move as amended by the
22	Staff Director.
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We've had the
25	discussion. All in favor.
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

(Vote taken.)

\sim
Z

Website Management

3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition.
4	The motion passes. Okay. Website Management is up
5	next. There is a motion that the Commission authorize
6	the removal of Commissioners' Thernstrom and
7	Redenbaugh's dissent in the report on voting
8	irregularities in Florida during the 2000 Presidential
9	Election from the Commission's website, and that the
10	dissent be placed with the following statement.
11	"Anyone who is interested in obtaining the July $19^{ ext{th}}$ " -
12	_
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, there's
14	something wrong with this.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Yes.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's not a
17	statement. It is the dissent itself.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: The dissent
20	itself was not what was up on the website.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. So what's up
22	there, is it a synopsis or
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, it was a
24	first draft, which is full of subsequently corrected

errors.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I got it now.
2	Okay. So the language would read, "Anyone who is
3	interested in obtaining the draft of the July $19^{ ext{th}}$,
4	2001 dissenting statement of Abigail Thernstrom and
5	Russell G. Redenbaugh from the voting irregularities
6	in Florida during the 2000 Presidential Election
7	report can find it on"
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No. The actual
9	dissent. It is the actual dissent that can be found.
10	What is now on the website is simply what was
11	submitted to Senate hearings, and was a very early
12	draft.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why wouldn't we
14	post the final dissent on our website?
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Because there
16	have been legal questions, the old legal questions
17	raised about the fact that it was uncompensated work
18	by Steven Thernstrom and John Lott that contributed to
19	the dissent.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. And so we will
21	just
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: If you
23	remember, the
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I do
25	remember.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: If you
2	remember, Christopher Edley said that problem could be
3	easily solved by paying each of them a dollar. And
4	that remains, it seems to me, an alternative, but
5	without getting into that whole legal question, people
6	who want to see it can simply go to my website.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Our website, I
9	should say.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We've had the
11	discussion.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, but it's
13	got to read properly here.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I move that the
16	Commission authorize the removal of Commissioner
17	Thernstrom and Redenbaugh's draft dissent, and anyone
18	interested in obtaining the final dissent, the dissent
19	in its final form can find it on www.
19 20	in its final form can find it on www. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Before we vote,
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Before we vote,
20 21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Before we vote, let's take a 15 minute recess.
202122	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Before we vote, let's take a 15 minute recess. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let me read the
revised motion into the record. This is a motion to
remove certain documents from the Commission's
website. I move that the Commission authorize the
removal of Commissioners Thernstrom and Redenbaugh's
draft dissent in the report on Voting Irregularities
in Florida during the 2000 Presidential Election from
the Commission's website, and that the dissent be
replaced with the following statement. "Anyone who is
interested in obtaining the July final statement of
Abigail Thernstrom and Russell G. Redenbaugh from the
Voting Irregularities in Florida during the 2000
Presidential Election report, which is not an official
document of the Commission, can find it on
www.thernstrom.com."
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Otherwise known
as www.thernstrom.com.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That is the
motion.
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second it.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Seconded.
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So we're
advertising the particular website or something?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'll just take that as
a joke. In any event, any additional conversation,

discussion? All in favor.

2

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

(Vote taken.)

3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Okay.
4	The motion passes. Okay. On a related matter, and
5	I'm fearful that this is going to cause problems - the
6	second motion relating to the website is that what we
7	agreed - I move that the Commission authorize the
8	removal of Appendix 9 of the Voting Irregularities in
9	Florida during the 2000 Presidential Election report
10	from the Commission's website, and that Appendix 9 be
11	replaced with the following statement. "Anyone who is
12	interested in obtaining the statement of Commissioner
13	Abigail Thernstrom and Russell G. Redenbaugh, as well
14	as the report by Dr. John Lott to the U.S. Senate
15	Committee on Rules and Administration which is not an
16	official document of the Commission, can find it or
17	www.thernstrom.com." Second?
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Wait a minute.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Wait a minute.

I haven't looked at this since those days, but is there a separate report by John Lott?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Isn't that that statistical information that --

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Does it have his name on it?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I believe so.

NEAL R. GROSS

	94
1	Yes.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's been a
3	long time since I've looked at this.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Jaffe.
5	MR. JAFFE: There are two documents on the
6	website. One is the draft dissent, and then in
7	Appendix 9 is that draft dissent again, in addition to
8	a second document that is listed under Dr. Lott's
9	name. But they're in two separate places on the
10	website, and if they're both to be removed, they have
11	to be removed by separate motions, or at least they'd
12	have to be pointed to in the motions.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is there a
14	second?
15	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
17	Discussion. All in favor.
18	(Vote taken.)
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? The
20	motion passes. Okay. The next motion up - I move
21	that the letter sent by the Staff Director to the
22	Department of Justice on May 19 th , 2005 on behalf of a

urging

investigate alleged racist incidents in Spring Valley,

Nevada be posted to the Commission website at the

the

Commission

unanimous

23

24

25

to

Department

95 1 earliest practicable time. Is there a second? COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? 3 All in 4 favor say aye. 5 (Vote taken.) Future Agenda Items 6 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? 8 motion passes. Okay. Future agenda items. During 9 the May Commission meeting, the Commission voted to 10 join other employers by citing a statement of support 11 for the National Guard and Reserve, pledging that 12 other things, that employment and among career 13 opportunities at the Commission will not be limited or reduced because of service in the Guard or Reserve. 14 15 The Commission has since signed onto that pledge, and 16 during the July Commission meeting, in a brief 17 presentation ceremony, representatives from the 18 National Guard and Reserve have offered to present the 19 Commission with a plaque expressing its gratitude. 20 Are there any objections to having this presentation -21 - I'm sorry. May I have a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are there any discussions to having this brief presentation at the next meeting? I want to point out, though, that the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

22

23

24

1 next meeting will be, I suspect, a full meeting. will take care of some of the usual Commission 2 3 business, and in addition to that, we will have our first briefing, so I just put that on the table. 4 5 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: One other thing I'll add is that the National Guard has indicated that 6 7 if they are going to have the ceremony, they will make 8 efforts to contact various media outlets about having 9 the whole thing carried on cable. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would defer to 12 the Staff Director on this question. If you think 13 it's a good idea, I'm willing to support it. If you 14 think it's too complicated --15 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: No, I agree with 16 the Chairman. I don't think it's too complicated. 17 think it can be brief. It's a nice thing to do, and a 18 nice statement, and it can bring more public attention 19 both to the National Guard, and to the July meeting of 2.0 the Commission. 21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I hope we will underscore the word "brief" in our communications 22 23 with them. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Just tell them they 24

have six minutes and be done with it.

	97
1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Unless they bring the
2	band.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So all in
4	favor.
5	(Vote taken.)
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? The
7	motion passes. Okay. Unless I have missed something,
8	I believe we're done, and may I have a motion to
9	adjourn the meeting.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Okay.
12	We're done.
13	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-
14	entitled matter went off the record at 11:56 a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	